





# SPEECH

OF

## HON. CHARLES H. LARRABEE, OF WISCONSIN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 17, 1859.

Mr. LARRABEE. Will the gentleman from New York yield me the floor?

Mr. JOHN COCHRANE. Certainly.

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Clerk, I was handed on yesterday, by the gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. DAVIDSON,] a newspaper that is published in my own State, and my attention was directed to some resolutions that purport to have been adopted at a large meeting of Germans in the city of Milwaukee. As it was the intention of that gentleman to address the House, and to have these resolutions read, I begged from him the privilege, as a Representative from the State of Wisconsin, to have them read myself, and refer to them.

The Clerk read the resolutions, as follows:

"Whereas the honorable John Brown was sent, to-day, from life to death, by the hangman's hand, because he intended to carry out practically one idea we approve, to liberate negroes held in bondage; and whereas it seems to be necessary, in these times of faint-heartedness and timidity, to express, frankly and openly, radical principles, notwithstanding the timid lamentations of the conservatives, and the shameless sneering of the ignorant rabble and its selfishness: Therefore

"Resolved, That we express our highest regard for the noble-hearted, courageous, and resolute John Brown, and that we will hold him, like other champions of freedom, in memory forever.

"Resolved, That, after having used all means to settle the slavery question in a peaceable manner, it is justifiable, in our judgment, to attain the object by the way of revolution, and that all responsibility for such a forced eventuality will fall upon the heads of those who refuse, with the utmost obstinacy, to set aside in a reformatory way an institution which is alike a shame for our age and for this Republic.

"Resolved, That we, as adopted citizens, especially, who had brought love of freedom and hate against tyranny of every kind to this country with us, feel bound to raise vigorously our voice against the institution of slavery, which degrades the slaves as well as their masters, and which endangers this Republic, the preservation and welfare of which we sincerely wish.

"Resolved, To publish these resolutions in all anti-slavery papers of the city of Milwaukee."

Mr. GROW. What newspaper is that read from?

Mr. LARRABEE. From the Wisconsin Free

Democrat. If either of my colleagues do not recognize that paper as a Republican newspaper, I would be glad to have him rise in his place and state so. I may ask, by-and-by, to have read an editorial from the same newspaper, indorsing fully these resolutions, and expressing, in language which conforms to the resolutions themselves, its hearty sympathy with them. It was stated the other day, by an honorable Senator from my State, in the other wing of the Capitol, that no Republican newspaper in the Northwest had yet supported John Brown in his invasion of the soil of Virginia. Perhaps the fact had not been brought to his attention; for, if it had, he would not have made the statement. I have now in my hand this Republican newspaper from the State of Wisconsin, which entertains these sentiments, which sustains these resolutions, and which supports the object of John Brown in his incursion into Virginia, to the fullest extent. Now, I need not to be informed by leading influential and patriotic Germans in the State of Wisconsin that these resolutions, which purport to have been adopted by a large meeting of German-American citizens, are not the expression of the opinion of that class of citizens in the State of Wisconsin.

I have lived among these men for the last fourteen years. I have lived in a county where the whole county organization and government were carried on by German citizens; and I feel it my duty here to say, in behalf of that people, that no more intelligent, no more loyal, no more patriotic men live on the soil of the United States, than they are. They are sternly hostile to fanaticism, and to sentiments of disunion and war on the South. For fear it may have gone out to this House and to the country that the sentiments contained in these resolutions are the sentiments of that class of our citizens, I have felt it my duty here—although I know that if I were to consult mere inferior views of personal success I would not attempt to address the House to-day—when my State has been alluded to here as resisting the laws

of the United States, as helping on this sentiment of disunion and aggression on the South, to rise in my place and roll back these accusations against the State which I have the honor in part to represent. Perhaps, sir, if I were impressed with a full consciousness of the responsibility that rests upon me, and if I were to measure that responsibility by the amount of population which I claim to represent on this floor, being over three hundred and sixty thousand people—more than in either of the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, or Oregon, and more than the white population of Mississippi or Arkansas—I would be very cautious and very careful as to what I said on this floor.

Having said thus much, if the House will give me its attention, I will submit a few remarks. I do not hope to say anything that will induce gentlemen upon the other side to change their course of action in the slightest; but if I can say anything that will induce those who help to make up the opposition to the Republican party in this House—those claiming to belong to national organizations, and to be opposed to the doctrines and to the genius and spirit of the Republican party—if I can say anything to those that will lead them to unite with us, for the purpose of preventing the representatives of the Republican party from occupying that chair, I shall be content.

Now, sir, I am an anti-Lecompton Democrat. I was an anti-Lecompton Democrat at that issue was a live issue. When the President sent in his message recommending the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution—although I had been a Democrat from my earliest youth, and although I was but a private citizen—I felt it to be my duty to my party to dissent from that recommendation. I know that it is always a dangerous thing for a man to stand up against his party. I know the benefit of party organization. I know that when a man takes his stand outside of that organization, yet claiming to represent its principles, he is charged with doing violence to the principles of his party, and tending to disrupt the organization itself.

But, sir, the Democrats of the State of Wisconsin took ground almost unanimously against the Lecompton policy of the Administration. While it was a living issue for the country, they stood there firm and fast. When it was settled by the adoption of the English bill, and by the vote of the people of Kansas under that bill, they recognized it as an issue gone into the past, and from that day to this there has been no recognition of any distinction between Democrats in that State. Looking to the near approach of the contest of 1860, we thought that we could not afford to throw away time on dead and past issues, when we had before us an active energetic foe, all pervading in the northern States, that demanded of every man that was a Democrat, or claimed to be a Democrat, to stand by his organization whatever his private griefs might be. And, sir, I have always understood that when we find wrongs and errors in our own party, the very best way to right those wrongs or to cure those errors is to remain inside of the organization; not to go out of it; not to join the Opposition; but to remain

inside the party organization; and there let our voices be heard. Now, to show that there is no issue between the different wings of the Democratic party, I need only mention the fact that every Democratic convention in every northwestern State has indorsed the national Administration upon all its measures except upon this Lecompton issue, and that being out of the way, there is now no division between the Democrats in that section. Except a discrimination which is attempted to be kept up by a few office-holders; but that number is so insignificant that they can hardly be dignified with the name of a party.

Sir, I have been astonished to hear gentlemen on this floor, who were Democrats, and who say they are Democrats, charging upon the Administration of Mr. Buchanan that it is wicked, that it is corrupt, that it is infamous. Why, sir, if this is so, I have learned the fact for the first time. I think I have watched the course of the President as carefully as those gentlemen here; and, although there have been many things that I might not myself subscribe to, yet at the same time, I know the high responsibility of that position; I know that but few men can fill it without being surrounded with difficulties; I know that it is the most delicate, the highest, and the most honorable position that a man can fill upon earth; and I always yield to the President of the United States the highest possible respect. I distrust those statements, today, for the present, as part of the executive chair, and it matters not to me whether he recognizes me as a Democrat or not, in the mere distribution of party Federal offices. Why, sir, that is but the smallest part of the duty of a Republican; it is the smallest field on which he can operate. No man should visit his mere personal grievances on his party. If there is any good whatsoever in party organization, it is for the purpose of carrying out proved principles; and no man should join a party for the mere attainment of his own selfish ends and purposes. We should give no aid or comfort, in any way, to the Opposition party. Now, there are gentlemen upon this floor, who think precisely as I did on the Lecompton question, who claim to be Democrats, and who elected as advocates of Democratic principles, and yet, for sometime, they have voted for the gentleman who has been put in nomination by the Republican party. Why is this? They could not, if they were to try, give any higher proof of their attachment to Republican principles than by voting for the gentleman who has been nominated by the Republican party. Now, sir, I hold that no man who claims to be a Democrat, or who is a Democrat in heart and in principle, ought to give aid or comfort, by his vote or by his voice, to the Republican party upon this floor.

Now, gentlemen, we who compose the majority of the members upon this floor all agree upon one thing, and that is: that the Republican party organization of the North is purely a sectional organization; and we must all agree that the inevitable result of the organization of sectional parties in this country must be the rupture of the American Union. I ask you if we have not met here to-day, face to face, that identical

state of facts which the Father of his Country, in his Farewell Address, warned the American people against allowing to exist? I ask you if we do not find, and have not found, since 1856, the organization of a great party based wholly on geographical lines? The Republican party is a purely sectional party. Their great leader, Mr. Seward, in his Rochester speech, enunciated the doctrine that there is an irrepressible conflict between the North and South—between free labor and slave labor.

I know not what could have induced him to announce this belief on his part. Ambition sometimes will lead men to go to a greater extent than any other passion. It may be, but it is not for me to question his motives, that with his eye fixed upon the presidential chair, he knows that the only way he can reach it is by appealing to sectional passion and sectional prejudice.

Why, sir, if any proof were required of the fact that the Republican party is aggressing upon the rights of the people of the South, it may be found in the platform of that party in the northwestern States. The platform of the Republican party in my own State contains doctrines which are inimical to the rights of the South, and the rights of the North even, under the Federal Constitution. They distinctly asseverate, sir, that they will resist the execution of the fugitive slave law. They denounce that law as unconstitutional. They say distinctly that they will never allow another slave State to come into the American Union. Look at the State of Massachusetts, with her personal liberty act; look at my own State, with her *habeas corpus* act, referred to by the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. CORKRY:] look at the fact that a very large proportion of Christian ministers who fill the pulpits of the North are members of the Republican party, and that they persistently denounce African slavery as a sin against God and humanity. We see sectional church organizations; we see those church organizations fostered and kept alive purely by this antagonism in the North to the institution of slavery in the South. In the State of Ohio a distinguished gentleman, who has occupied the bench there ever since my own boyhood days, has been ostracised by the Republican party for daring to stand up and decide the fugitive slave law to be constitutional.

And, Mr. Clerk, here is this gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. CORKRY:] who has only furnished his complexion to the Republican party—would to God he had imbued them with some of his national principles—here, sir, is that gentleman standing alone in his position so far as I am able to observe. He claims upon this floor that he is a representative of the Republican party of the State of Ohio, and of the Republican party of the Union. It is not so. His sentiments enunciated in the States of Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, and Iowa would be denounced as Democratic sentiments. He never could run as a Republican candidate in either of those States. Does he say that he will never vote for the admission of another slave State? Does he say that he believes the fugitive slave law to be unconstitutional? Does he say that he will resist the operation of that law? No, sir; he does not say so; but he stands upon the Philadelphia platform.

Mr. Clerk, I will tell you where the trouble is. In their national convention, the Republican party endeavored to frame a national platform. They attempt to make their party national; but when they go to State conventions they frame a different sort of platform. When they go upon the stump they talk different sentiments from those contained in their national platform. I have heard, time and again, Republican orators before the people denouncing slavery as a curse, and slave holders as monsters. They appeal to the feelings of the people, and take advantage of them, for the purpose of getting seats upon this floor. When they get here, however, they announce different sentiments from those they have declared at home.

Let me ask my anti-Lecompton friends why it is that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CORKRY] acts with the Republican party? Why simply because, while that party is wrong, he will remain inside the organization, and therein correct the wrong. That is what we should do at all times; but I fear that he cannot do it. I fear that it will be utterly impossible for him to nationalize the Republican party. I know that it will be impossible for him to carry along with him, upon the Philadelphia platform, any large portion of the Republican party of the Northwest. He denounces the Helper book, but his candidate for Speaker does not. He denounces the Brown raid, but Governor Chase does not.

Now, sir, I ask why it is that with these facts before us, with this Helper book issued and circulated for the purpose of exciting bad passions against the people of the South—I ask why it is that the Republican candidate for Speaker does not rise in his place and denounce the infamous sentiments of that book? Will it not go before the country, because of his silence, that he approves of it? I do not say that he fears to lose votes; he gets upon the floor and denounces that book. He may have his own policy; but, sir, I tell him that his silence upon this floor, upon this matter, carries with it the significant fact that he does indorse that Helper book.

Now, Mr. Clerk, it will not be denied by gentlemen upon the other side, that there is a large and controlling element in the Republican party which is in favor of making aggression upon the rights of the people of the South. They will not deny that there is a large and controlling portion of that party which is opposed to the execution of the fugitive slave law. They will not deny that there is a large element of that party which will never submit to the admission of another slave State into the Union. And, sir, they will not deny that, without that element, that strength, they cannot carry a single northern State, or a single congressional district. And yet, how is it when they come here? Has a man got up upon this floor to represent the peculiar views of Horace Greeley? Has anybody got up to enunciate the opinions of the Wisconsin Republican party, or of the Republican party of Minnesota, of Michigan, or of Iowa? No, sir; not one. Is there a man upon that side of the House who will say, in his place, that he will never vote for the admission of another slave State into the Union? Is there a man there who will say that he will

resist the fugitive slave law? Not one of them has risen in his place to say these things. Why do they keep silence? Why is it, when they know the fact that the South is justly indignant and excited at the sentiments of the Republican party in the North, that they allow two or three men, who have hearts and intellects moved with a love for the Union, to speak for them? Why do they keep silence, and permit sentiments to be expressed as theirs, when they do not entertain them?

How great, sir, will be the responsibility of those gentlemen from the North or the South who will aid in any way the election of the representative of the peculiar sentiment we denounce. Whether they be South Americans, or whether they be anti-Leocompton Democrats, how great is their responsibility! I hope, gentlemen, that, before you take another ballot, you may reflect that what you may do indirectly may do as great injury to your organization as anything you may do directly. These anti-Leocompton Democrats who do not act with me and those around me, as I understand it, notwithstanding they were elected outside of the Democratic organization, yet were elected as Democrats. They were elected enunciating Democratic principles. They were elected upon their pledges to support, not the Philadelphia, but the Cincinnati platform. Any action, therefore, upon their part, or non-action, which leads to Republican success, is a violation of their pledges before the people. I care not whether their course be action or non-action; they were elected as Democrats, and not Republicans.

Now, sir, I have never had any doubt but that the raid of John Brown at Harper's Ferry was the legitimate result of the teachings of an extreme wing of the Republican party of the North; not the teachings of such men as the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. CORWIN,] the gentlemen from Illinois, [Mr. KELLOGG,] or the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. KILGORE,] who have here denounced it; but of men who occupy the pulpits of the North, of such papers as the New York Tribune, of such men as Wendell Phillips—that it is the result of such teachings, and that it can be ascribed to no other.

I have listened upon this floor with great pain to statements made by southern men, calmly, coolly, and deliberately, of what is the state of public sentiment in their own sections of the Union. I refer not now to the passionate appeals of some gentlemen; I refer not now to the indignant denunciations of others; but I refer to the calm and deliberate statements of gentlemen who are advanced in years, who have occupied for a long time seats upon this floor, who are recognized, even by gentlemen upon the other side, as rational men, sound men, intelligent, and patriotic men—statements made by those men that there is imminent danger that the South must divide from the North.

Sir, I have never until recently allowed myself to think for one moment that a dissolution of the American Union was a possible thing. But, sir, I am constrained to say that if men's passions are worked upon as they have been for a few years past; if the North shall persistently excite

feeling against the South and the South retch it against the North, that the dissolution of the Union is not a question of time, but that it may be now here, though we may be going through the forms of Government. You may be sitting upon this floor thinking you are representing constituencies at home, but I tell you that when men can be arrayed against each other, as we see they are here, one little overt act, one step too far, may precipitate that result which we all say we fear. Now, sir, I have always thought that this Government of ours was like a perpetual motion; that it would run itself; that it would run in spite of politicians and not because of any assistance they could render to it. I want to think so yet, and I want to see the time come, and come shortly, when men may meet together upon this floor like brothers, join in social intercourse, join hand in hand to carry out those public measures which are necessary for the good of the country; when northern men can go to the South and southern men go to the North, and each be received by the other like brothers.

But, sir, I fear we have reached the legitimate and necessary result of these passionate appeals to sectional prejudices. Gentlemen may say here that they meant nothing when they incorporated such principles into their platforms—the doctrine of resistance to the extension of slavery, and the doctrine that, under no conceivable circumstances, will they allow another slave State to be admitted into the Union. You may come here and take back those words, or explain away their significance, but of what avail is it? A man may go into the streets and collect a mob around him, may appeal to their passions, and he may not mean what he says; but can he tell how the men that hear him may act? Can he tell how many John Browns may be in the crowd who may practicalize his teachings upon the first occasion? So it is with the enunciation of the honorable Senator from New York, the leader of the Republican party, that there is an irrepressible conflict between free and slave labor. Suppose it were true as an abstract proposition, no great leader of a great party in this country should have enunciated such a doctrine; no leader, no patriot, would have crystallized it into expression or publicity. It may be the truth, though I do not admit it, and in the minds of some men it may be a philosophical fact, that there is a conflict between free and slave labor. A gentleman may have entertained that sentiment with sincerity, but does it become him, knowing the fact that slavery exists in southern States by virtue of the guarantees of the Federal Constitution, to enunciate it in any public speech? How does he know how many John Browns may hear him who will carry out his teachings, not in the way he desired to have them carried out, but in a way that they might seek out for themselves?

There is one other significant fact; and that is, that you never hear a Republican speaker, either here or at the hustings, denouncing abolition sentiments. I never heard one in my life, and I have seen it in no Republican press. Do you denounce Wendell Phillips? do you denounce the treasonable utterances of Cheever? No, you do not. You apply them to your own elevation to office; you

apply them to the strengthening of your own party, and for the purpose of placing a man of your own kind in the presidential chair. The country is nothing in your view. The rights of any portion of it under the Constitution are nothing in your view. You march over them, trample them down, carrying out but the single idea of mere ambitious projects to attain the control of the Government. Do these men ever vote the Democratic ticket? Did Cheever ever vote it? Does an Abolitionist ever vote it? Never. But these gentlemen on the other side—these national, conservative men from Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio, who have spoken here, will act side by side, in the political battles of the country, with those men who, they know, are preaching treason to the country and to the Constitution. I have had, at one time, respect for the Republican organization. I have respect for that principle in their platform which says that it is in the power and is the duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in the Territories. I know from whence it came—from the hitherto action of the Government—and that they might rest, as a great party, on that idea. But I cannot see how they can rest on the State platforms or on the doctrines enunciated every day on the stump and in their presence.

Now, Mr. Clerk, I have made this statement time and again; I have made this denunciation of their peculiar abolition principles time and time again. And when I have denounced them, and stood up for the Constitution and the rights of all sections of the Union, I have been myself denounced as a doughface, as a tool of the South. And it is for you, gentlemen of the South, to know the fact that we men of the North who stand by the Constitution and its compromises and guarantees have to meet this sectional organization face to face every day of our lives.

Now, Mr. Clerk, on this question of slavery I probably differ from most gentlemen on this floor. I do not think that there is any irrepressible conflict between free labor and slave labor. I do not think it is there the conflict is; I think the conflict is the world-recognized one between the races of men. I have never subscribed to the doctrine of the unity of the human race. I do not believe that it is a single race of men. I believe in the plurality of races. The trouble with us here in this country is simply that there is a conflict of races. That conflict commenced when we first peopled or attempted to people this continent. We found here a race of men with distinguishing and marked characteristics, differing from ourselves.

The trouble with the African is, that with us he is out of his place and position on the earth. Does he not possess marked characteristics distinguishing him, not only in color and in form, but in mental and moral organization? Does he not differ from the white man, the red man, the yellow man? Has not every race its peculiarities differing from the others? Now what is the marked characteristic of the black man—the African? It is that he possesses the principle of affection, controlling him at all times and predominating in him, to a much greater degree than it is possessed by any other race. It is that principle which subjugates his other passions and controls them. Now, what is

the distinguishing characteristic of the white man? It is his intellect, with which he controls his affections and will, at all times. Hence, the white race is the race to form governments, to establish seminaries of learning, to invent the press, the telegraph, the steam engine, to spread Christianity, to go on conquering, and to conquer all races with which it comes in contact. That has been its history. That will be its history.

Now, what is the distinguishing characteristic of the red man—of the North American Indian? It is his will, resulting in carrying out the principle of revenge. That principle in the North American Indian absolutely controls his affections and his intellect.

Thus you have the race of intellect and the race of will in contact. What is the natural result? Either one or the other must be exterminated. Is not that going on now? Where is the red man? Fading away before the progress of the white man. You have not enslaved the red man, although Massachusetts attempted to do it at an early day in the history of that colony. But with the black man, the race of affection, when he is in contact with the race of intellect, that race compels him and coerces him to some form or other of servitude; and, from the fact that he does possess this qualification he becomes a servant. If he did not possess it, you could not make him a slave. Without intellect, without invention, without the marked characteristics which distinguish the other two races—either intellect or will—when you place him in contact with the white race, he must be subjugated into servitude.

And after all—recognizing the fact that the black man is out of his place on the earth when in contact with the white race, that he was here, is here, will be here—the only question is, what particular form of servitude he will be in. It is not a question of slavery or freedom. It is not a question of citizenship, or of servitude and inferiority. It is a question of the form of servitude—nothing else. What would we do with these men, if free? What could the North do with these millions, if they were there free? You know we do not want them with us. You know that the action of every northern State, with the exception of one or two, is directed persistently to driving out these black men. You know that when you fought your battles in Kansas, where was carried out practically the doctrine of popular sovereignty, and when you formed a constitution there—you not only did not make citizens of negroes, but you absolutely prohibited negroes from coming within the borders of the State.

Now, what would you do with them? You do not want them at the North. You could not take care of them as well as their masters can, who have lived with them from their youth up. You cannot break apart this organization and this system that has entwined itself into every social and political fiber of that great people who inhabit one half of the Union. No radical or sudden change can take place. Do you mean to accomplish it by slow means? Do you mean to do what your press, your stump speeches, your sermons in church every Sabbath, recommend? Do you mean to do it by the adoption of your platforms which

are antagonistic to the principles of the Constitution? Do you mean to do it by holding one position before the people, and coming here and holding a different one? You cannot do it in that way. You cannot do it inside the American Union. If you do it at all, you must do it outside of the Union. The idea of a peaceable solution of such a question never has addressed itself to my judgment. It cannot be done peacefully by any party organization whatsoever. It is a problem which is in the hands of God, and which can only be solved by the slow progress of time.

Gentlemen on the other side, and Republican orators at the North, always appeal to the Declaration of Independence—that all men are created equal; and they go on to argue from that, directly and positively, that these black men were intended to be included in that Declaration and to be incorporated as citizens under this system of Government of ours. Now, sir, this is a mere abstract statement. It could not have been that Jefferson meant that all men were created with equal rights under any particular form of government; for we know that government does not proceed directly from God, but is the result of human thought, human intellect, and human will. What did he mean? It is true that they are equal in the sight of God; they bear the same relation to time and eternity that we all do; but they are not created with equal political rights, nor was it ever so intended. We know precisely the contrary, because slavery existed at the time the Constitution was formed, and if it had been intended to incorporate these men in this political community it would have been so said in the Constitution itself.

Now, I want to say a few words to gentlemen upon this side of the House. I know that these words would come with much greater force from someone other than myself. I will acknowledge that I should not place myself in the position of attempting to advise those gentlemen who are acting with me in the organization of the House when I have had so little experience in this arena, but I have a few words to say to you, gentlemen, and I hope you will hear me.

A studious silence has been preserved on the other side of this House. I suppose the philosophy of it is, that they may go to the country and say that we are consuming the time in debate instead of voting. I suppose the philosophy of it is, that there is a contrariety of sentiment upon that side of the House, and that, if Mr. SUMNER should get up and declare his true sentiments—if he should place himself by the side of Mr. CONWAY, he could not get the whole of that side to vote for him, and consequently they do not allow the clash of sentiment that we do here. I am glad that, in this party of ours, we can discuss questions of principle and questions of policy, and can disagree; but when the time comes to battle our common enemy, we can stand side by side and forget our differences. Now, a word as to this firebrand which they have attempted to throw into our midst—the question of slavery in the Territories of the United States. I told you all that I was an anti-Lea-compton Democrat, that when that issue was alive I differed with you, and took early occasion to express my difference,

but that, when it was dead, I buried it. And I think it would be very poor policy for us to permit it to be dug up again by our enemies.

Now, gentlemen, this question of slavery in the Territories is purely an abstract question, in my view. When a great party is organized upon principle, it is done for the purpose of carrying out that principle upon some present or approaching occasion, and not as a mere abstraction; not for something a hundred years hence, but with reference to something that has to be done here, now, this year or next year. Will you tell me what possible practical question can come up this winter in regard to any Territory of the United States? Not one. Will our friends upon the other side, who are the impersonation of the idea of congressional intervention to prohibit the extension of slavery, introduce a bill prohibiting its existence in any Territory? Will they do it this session? Have they done it for four years? In 1856, they incorporated that idea in their platform. Have they attempted to carry it out in either branch of Congress during the last four years? I think not. They were elected last year upon the same pledge. Will they introduce such a bill this winter? Oh, no; they will not do it. Why not? Because the question is absolutely settled in the minds of all intelligent men in every organized Territory in the United States. Is it not settled in Washington Territory? In Utah, in Kansas, and in Nebraska? Is it not settled in New Mexico? I think it is.

I think no effort will be made, either on that side of the House or on this, this winter, or the next, either to establish slavery in any one of those Territories, or to prohibit it there from. Why? Because the common sentiment of the people of those Territories has already settled the question. Kansas has decided that it does not want slavery. Enough said; we are to abide by that. New Mexico has decided that she does want slavery; enough said; I agree to that. It is their business, and not mine. As an individual, and an American citizen, I would be willing to concede to every southern man the right to go into every Territory with his slaves, and hold them there until a State constitution is formed. I would concede that right; but of what possible practical use could it be? Why, a thousand laws of Congress cannot force slavery into a Territory against the will of the people; and a thousand laws of Congress cannot prohibit slavery where the people want it. Hence, I think we might save our time and energies, and not throw them away upon a purely abstract question, which is absolutely settled in every Territory of the United States. Why not let the question rest? Why keep it alive? Why excite the passions of the North against the South, and of the South against the North?

Why, sir, if I were an inhabitant of a southern Territory, I should laugh at you men here attempting to prohibit slavery, if I wanted it; and if I were an inhabitant of a northern Territory, I should laugh at you for attempting to establish it there, or to force it there, if I did not want it. If I lived in a southern Territory, among southern men, where slavery existed, I would own slaves myself. I would not think that I was thereby guilty of a moral wrong. I would take these servants,



and I would expend upon them my energies and my intellect to train and protect them, and in every way to do my duty before God to those thus placed under my care and guidance. But, in a northern climate, in Kansas or Nebraska, or my own State, I do not want slaves. These sons of the tropics are of no use to us there. We cannot elevate them to political equality with ourselves, and we do not want them there at all. There is not one man in one hundred thousand, in the Northwest, who wants this race of men among us. I know it. They are not capable of self-government. They must be servants, if they come among us, without power on our part to direct or guide them in their service, lacking, as they do, intellect and capacity for progress.

Hence, gentlemen of the South, first, climate, and second, the prevailing sentiment of the people of each Territory, will settle the question of African slavery.

I submit, then, to you, in all frankness, as a brother, as a fellow-citizen of yours, as one acting with you inside of the only national party, upon which rests the destiny of this Union—I submit to you, who have voted against me: you gentlemen of Pennsylvania, you of New Jersey, you of New York, and you of the South, that you ought to stand by my side, in resisting the aggression of this Republican party upon the Constitution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will allow me, I will show him how I think that the question of slavery can be introduced at this session of Congress.

Mr. LARRABEE. I do not like to be interrupted from my own side of the House. When the question comes up I will be prepared to act upon it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will show you how it can arise, and how anti-Leecompton Democrats, Leecompton Democrats, and South Americans will differ with the Republican party. A proposition may be presented for the organization of the Territory of Arizona. The Republican party holds the doctrine that Congress has the power, and that it is its duty, to exclude slavery from that Territory, or any other. The South Americans differ from that doctrine, as do the Democrats, both Leecompton and anti-Leecompton.

The Republican party, when it proposes that act of prohibition of slavery to Arizona, will then be opposed by all the other parties in this House besides. Does not the gentleman see, then, how the question may arise at this session?

Mr. LARRABEE. When that question comes up I will be prepared to act upon it. I will vote against any law, either for establishing or prohibiting slavery in any of the Territories of the United States. It may be that Arizona will apply for a territorial government, and that then the question of congressional prohibition of slavery will come up. I admit that; but I do not think that her application for a territorial government is so near at hand as does the gentleman. The gentleman from Georgia has his views, and I have mine. I will try to convince him that I am right when the proper time comes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not differing with the gentleman as to the want of power in Congress

to prohibit slavery. I agree with him, and have, in what I have said, only showed how the question may arise at this session.

Mr. LARRABEE. I did not distinctly hear what the gentleman said. I am glad that we agree. I wish to say a few words to gentlemen who are known as the southern Opposition. I was much pleased with the speech of the honorable gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. NELSON.] I recognized in that speech the sentiments of a national man, the sentiments of a man who loved the Union and who loved the Constitution. Yet, sir, whilst our sentiments are the same, whilst we both are opposed to disunion, both stand upon the Constitution, are both determined to give the men of the North, of the South, of the East, and of the West, their just constitutional rights, our action is entirely different. Why, sir, after having battled at home with this Republican abolition idea, after having been charged with being a doughface and an abject slave of the South, simply because I believed the fugitive slave law to be constitutional, simply because I believed that every State had the right to settle the question of slavery for itself; when I come upon this floor and seek to act with men who agree with me upon those questions, I find some of them standing aloof and indirectly lending aid and comfort to that very party which I have been battling at home. If I understand the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee, I can respect the sentiment which is at the bottom of their political organization. I do not agree with them, if I understood what he said. He said that their organization was based upon a love of country, upon a love of the Constitution; that it was based upon the idea of preventing one religious denomination, or power, coercing others, or getting the control of this Government. Did I understand him aright? He assents that I did. I can, then, sir, respect the basis of that organization, although I cannot agree in the necessity or the policy for any such organization. I think that there is not the slightest danger from the cause stated.

Now, gentlemen of the southern Opposition, those of us, few we may be, who are here from the North, are hereafter having successfully overcome this abolition idea, this sentiment of aggression upon your rights under the Federal Constitution. Is it not the time now for those who are lovers of the Constitution and the Union to act together? I submit it to you, whether I shall go to my home and have these Republicans charge that when I went for the rights of the South, under the Constitution, the South rejected my efforts and my sacrifices?

And, Mr. Clerk, I want gentlemen of the Democratic party from the South to recollect another thing; and that is, that the Democratic party of the North, in the proportion of two to one, exceeds the Democratic party of the South.

We do not carry States, you will say. But, gentlemen, the time is near at hand when we will carry them; and I tell you, gentlemen of the South, who believe that there is an all-pervading sentiment at the North which is determined to drive slavery from the country, that there is positively no such all-pervading sentiment. It is confined

to that wing of the Republican party which is represented by Giddings, Greeley, Cheever, and that class of men, and not by that part of the Republican party which is represented by the gentleman from Ohio—I mean Mr. CORWIN. As far as Mr. SHERMAN, the candidate of the other side for Speaker, is concerned, he is now the incarnation of the abolition idea, unless he gets upon this floor and denounces that doctrine.

I want to say to you, gentlemen of the South, that I am not a slaveholder, as you know, and I do not propose to discuss here the merits or demerits of your institution of slavery. If I lived in your midst, as I said before, I would own slaves, and yet not deem that I was doing a moral wrong to any one. But, gentlemen, there is a necessity, a great necessity, that you and we should bury all past differences, and unite upon some common ground, in order that we may overcome those who are opposed to us. Will you do it? You can do it if you will.

There is one sentiment which has been advanced here by gentlemen of the South, from which I will not omit this opportunity to make my dissent, and that is the right of a peaceful secession from the Union. I hold that there is no such right. It is the right of revolution—that I admit. But I will not admit that one State can go out of the Union, leaving the Union in existence. The moment one of those stars fall, they all fall. You cannot go out of the Union leaving an aggregation of States behind. In that case a provisional government must be immediately formed. We can not exist under the Constitution unless every present American State is inside of and belongs to the Union. There is no such thing as an American State outside of the Union. As for myself, I feel as if my highest allegiance, my warmest affections, are for the American Union. I love my own State perhaps as well as any American citizen loves his, but the interests of my own State are subordinate to the interests of the whole American Union; the interests of my own State are nothing compared with the interests of all the States of this Union. Why, sir, when I am, by my toast, it is not that I am a citizen of Wisconsin, but that I am an American citizen. If I had a primary allegiance to any State in the Union, I should have to owe allegiance to five States, because, like most western boys, I have traveled North, South, East, and West, and I finally brought up in the best State of all. [Laughter.] I am a native of the Empire State; but I once had the honor of living neighbor to my friend in the State of Mississippi. [Mr. Davis.] I listened, when a boy, to the legal teachings of the honorable gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. CORWIN.]

Mr. CORWIN. Sound they were.

Mr. LARRABEE. Sound, you think they were. I am sorry I cannot say as much for his political teachings. I heard him when he attacked the sub-treasury law in 1840, and when he said, if it was not repealed, that it would overcome the Union; that it would knock the pillars out from under the edifice; and yet the Union exists to-day, and my friend exists, and the only thing he has done for the good of his country in the mean time

is the furnishing his complexion to the Republican party. [Laughter.] I have lived a portion of my time with these brave men from the State of Illinois; and yet, Mr. Clerk, I entertain no allegiance to either one of those States, or to the State which I, in part, represent here to-day, which shall in any event interfere with my allegiance to the whole American Confederacy. That is my position, and that is my sentiment. I tell you gentlemen who have been claiming all there is of affection for South Carolina and Georgia, that I will resist your claim. Those States are as much mine as yours; and it's a very pretty piece of selfishness in you to attempt to deprive me of my share. I will not contemplate the effects of disunion. Gentlemen have contemplated them upon this floor. Who that knows what human nature is, imagines that it has changed with the progress of intelligence, liberty, arts, or letters; and I tell you that, if you contemplate the peaceful separation of this Union, you are coming without your host. Men's passions are the same now they ever were, and it cannot be done.

If you want to see the "dark and bloody ground of Kentucky" stretched across this whole continent from east to west, then contemplate, or dare contemplate, the disruption of the American Union. You would see a strip of country between the northern and southern States, two hundred miles wide, the theater of conflict between the North and South, devastated, and abandoned, and every inhabitant who lives upon it. Provisional governments would be formed, one South, one West—and by the West I mean all the country watered by the Mississippi—and one Northeast. I tell you, gentlemen from the New England States, very freely, for I think it is true, that there is very little common between the North-west and yours lives, and in seeing a contingency as a disruption of the Union, we can hardly look for any unity of sentiment between us. I think we would not get together. We would then have three or four separate confederacies.

I said, gentlemen, I would not contemplate the effects of a disruption; but I ask you, men of the North and men of the South, if all the negroes that exist in the world are worthy, for one moment, to be weighed in the balance with the influences which this great Confederacy of white men are exercising upon the whole civilized world? With this people and this form of government rests the responsibility of the progress, throughout the world of letters, of art, of civilization and Christianity. I believe it from the bottom of my heart. You all know that the people, not only in this country, but in other countries, are contemplating us here. You all know—those of you whose words are entitled to weight by reason of your experience, by reason of your years, by reason of your patriotism—that every word which falls from your lips is drunk up eagerly from Maine to Georgia.

In conclusion, Mr. Clerk, I beg to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the floor. I am very well, and that it would be much better if I had said nothing at so early a period of the session. I have done.



